UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,506	05/18/2005	Juergen Hofmann	30882/DP024	4301

4743   7590   02/24/2009
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
6300 SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6357

EXAMINER
HON, MING Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _23 December 2008_.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1 and 3-14_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1 and 3-14_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _15 August 2005_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:
       1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's amendment filed on December 23, 2008 is acknowledged. Currently Claims
1, 3-14 are pending. Claims 1, 8, and 12 has been amended. Claim 2 is cancelled.

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect independent claims 1 and 8 have been considered but
are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Amended claims 1 and 8 results in a different
scope than that of the originally presented Claim 1 and 8 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Grohs et al. US2003/0169446 hereinafter referred to as Grohs and
further in view of Gassho USPN 71364861**

        As per Claim 1, Grohs teaches a system for the automatic generation of printable files
for printed mailpieces from data in a database, said system comprising a printing system
comprising at least one print processing component having at least one of a printer and a

printable file processor, (Grohs, Figure 1, Component 16 and 18) wherein the printing system comprises at least one print job generation element, (Grohs, Figure 1, Component 16)

the database being located outside of the area of the printing system, (Grohs, Figure 1, Component 20 and Component 16 are remote from each other)

the print job generation element is capable of requesting and receiving data from the database, and data in the database constitutes jobs from users pertaining to the printing of mailpieces, (Groh, Figure 2, Component 12 and 38, able to retrieve and request data from the database (Figure 2, "print provider proxy"). The database contains print jobs sent from the user which are documents)

and the print job generation element prepares the data from the database as a function of the requirements of the print processing component, and generates printable files for printed mailpieces. (Grohs, Figure 2, Component 16 and 18, processing the print job received from the database and then to be printed by print services. It is well known in the art that at the print. The term mailpieces is referring to pieces of mail. There is no mailing step therefore mailpieces are considered to be documents.)

Grohs does not teach the print job generation element being connected to a server via a first interface, the server being connected to a database via a second interface; However Gassho teaches it. (Gassho, Figure 1, Component 42, 34, and 44; the server will be the proxy server and the database will be the content server)

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Gassho into Grohs. Grohs teaches a communication link between the print provider proxy and the print provider. The location of the print provider proxy and the print provider can be distant from each other to allow more users the ability to send print jobs to the print provider proxy. As seen in Gassho, there is use of proxy server as intermediate go-betweens connecting the user to the internet to the database. Gassho and Grohs are in the same endeavor of obtaining data from a server to print.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the two references to obtain the invention in Claim 1.

As per Claim 3, Grohs in view of Gassho teaches the system according to Claim 1, wherein the print job generation element is a program on at least one computer of the printing system. (Grohs, Figure 1, Component 20, 25, 27, and 16, it is well known that for the print provider to interface with a print provider proxy through a firewall requires use of a computer and computer has programs)

      Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 1.

As per Claim 6, Grohs in view of Gassho teaches the system according to Claim 1, wherein the print job generation element can be connected to the server temporarily and/or permanently via the Internet. (Gassho, Column 4, Lines 23-30)

      Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 1.

As per Claim 8, Grohs in view of Gassho teaches a method for the automatic generation of printable files, for printing mailpieces, from data in a database, wherein the files are generated, printed out and/or further processed by a printing system comprising at least one print processing component and one print job generation element, (Grohs, Figure 1, Component 16 and 18) the method comprising:

      the print job generation element generating a first message that contains a call to a server for a specific method with parameters, (Grohs, Figure 2, Component 38, query is consider a call)

      the print job generation element transmitting the first message to the server via the first interface, (Grohs, Figure 2, Component 38, query is consider a call)

      the server processing the first message by calling the specific method with appertaining parameters, (Grohs, Figure 2, Components 38, 36, with the parameters such as a request of a specific print job to retrieve)

      the server retrieving data from the database via the second interface, the data in the database constituting lobs from users pertaining to the printing of mailpieces, (Figure 2, "print provider proxy". The database contains print jobs sent from the user which are documents)

the server sending the result of the call for the specific method in the form of a second message back to the print job generation element, and the print job generation element generating at least one printable file for printed mailpieces from the result of the call for the specific method. (Grohs, Figure 2, Component 16 and 18, processing the print job received from the database and then to be printed by print services. It is well known in the art that at the print. The term mailpieces is referring to pieces of mail. There is no mailing step therefore mailpieces are considered to be documents.)

Grohs does not teach the print job generation element establishing a connection to the server via a first interface; the server establishing a connection to the database via a second interface, the database being located outside of the area of the printing system; However Gassho teaches it. (Gassho, Figure 1, Component 42, 34, and 44; the server will be the proxy server and the database will be the content server)

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Gassho into Grohs. Grohs teaches a communication link between the print provider proxy and the print provider. The location of the print provider proxy and the print provider can be distant from each other to allow more users the ability to send print jobs to the print provider proxy. As seen in Gassho, there is use of proxy server as intermediate go-betweens connecting the user to the internet to the database. Gassho and Grohs are in the same endeavor of obtaining data from a server to print.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the two references to obtain the invention in Claim 8.

As per Claim 13, Grohs in view of Gassho teaches the method according to Claim 8 comprising the print job generation element checking at the start whether any updates are available on the server and updating its configuration automatically if an update is available. (Gassho, Figure 13, Step (1)) , print job generation element checking at the start whether any updates are available on the server is equivalent of the user submitting a request to access the print generation element or content database because it will update the request.)

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 8.

As per Claim 14, Grohs in view of Gassho teaches the method according to Claim 13, comprising transmitting a new processing file during the updating procedure. (Gassho, Figure 13, Step (1)) , print job generation element checking at the start whether any updates are available on the server is equivalent of the user submitting a request to access the print generation element or content database because it will update the request. The request is sent in a message or a file)

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 13.

5.   Claims 4-5 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grohs in view of Gassho as applied to Claim 1 and 8 respectively and further in view of Che-Mponda et al. US2003/0069801 hereinafter referred to as Che-Mponda.

As per Claim 4, Grohs in view of Gassho teaches the system according to Claim 1, Grohs in view of Gassho does not teach wherein the first interface is a SOAP (Simple Object Access Protocol) interface, while the server is a SOAP server; However Che-Mponda teaches it. (Che-Mponda, Paragraph [0056])

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Che-Mponda into Grohs in view of Gassho. Grohs in view of Gassho teaches a first interface between the server and the print generation unit but was silent on how the two units are interfaced. SOAP was a popular protocol used at the time of the invention was made and allowed effective communication between two units as in peer to peer connection. There would have been beneficial to use a SOAP protocol in the first interface.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the three references to obtain the invention in Claim 4.

As per **Claim 5**, Grohs in view of Gassho and Che-Mponda teaches the system according to Claim 4, wherein the SOAP interface uses HTTP/HTTPS as a data transmission protocol. (Che-Mponda, Paragraph [0056])

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 4.

As per **Claim 9**, Grohs in view of Gassho teaches the method according to Claim 8. Gassho does not teach comprising communicating between the print job generation element and the server takes place via a SOAP (Simple Object Access Protocol) interface; However Che-Mponda teaches it. (Che-Mponda, Paragraph [0056])

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Che-Mponda into Grohs in view of Gassho. Grohs in view of Gassho teaches a first interface between the server and the print generation unit but was silent on how the two units are interfaced. SOAP was a popular protocol used at the time of the invention was made and allowed effective communication between two units as in peer to peer connection. There would have been beneficial to use a SOAP protocol in the first interface.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the three references to obtain the invention in Claim 9.

As per **Claim 10**, Grohs in view of Gassho and Che-Mponda teaches the method according to Claim 9, comprising communicating via an Apache SOAP API (Application Programming Interface). (Che-Mponda, Paragraph [0056])

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 9.

6.   Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grohs in view of Gassho as applied to Claim 1 and 8 and further in view of Gluckman US2002/0161744.

As per Claim 7, Gassho teaches the system according to Claim 1. Gassho does not teach wherein the second interface is a PL/SQL (Procedural Language/Structured Query Language) layer; However Gluckman teaches it. (Gluckman, Paragraph [0017])

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Gluckman into Gassho. Gassho teaches a second interface between a server and database but was silent on how the two units are interfaced. PL/SQL was a popular layer used at the time of the invention was made and allowed effective communication between an accessing unit and database. There would have been clearly beneficial to use a PL/SQL interface.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the three references to obtain the invention in Claim 7.

As per Claim 11, Grohs in view of Gassho teaches the method according to Claim 8. Grohs in view of Gassho does not teach comprising communicating between the server and the database takes place via a PL/SQL (Procedural Language/Structured Query Language) layer; However Gluckman teaches it. (Gluckman, Paragraph [0017])

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Gluckman into Grohs in view of Gassho. Grohs in view of Gassho teaches a second interface between a server and database but was silent on how the two units are interfaced. PL/SQL was a popular layer used at the time of the invention was made and allowed effective communication between an accessing unit and database. There would have been clearly beneficial to use a PL/SQL interface.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the three references to obtain the invention in Claim 11.

7.   **Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grohs in view of Gassho as applied to Claim 8 and further in view of Che-Mponda et al. US2003/0069801 hereinafter referred to as Che-Mponda and McLaughlin, Brett, Java & XML 2nd Edition: Chapter 12: SOAP, August 8, 2001,**

http://oreilly.com/catalog/javaxml2/chapter/ch12.htm **hereinafter referred to as**
McLaughlin.

        As per Claim 12, Grohs in view of Gassho teaches the method according to Claim
8, comprising the steps of:

- the print job generation element (Gassho, Figure 1, Component 44)

- the print job generation element (Gassho, Figure 1, Component 44)

to the print job generation element. (Gassho, Figure 1, Component 44)

Gassho does not teach:

-generating a first message by calling an instance of a call class of an Apache SOAP (Simple
Object Access Protocol) API (Application Programming Interface) and sets setting properties of
this object,

-transmitting the first message to the server,

- on the part of the server, a web server accepting the first message with the call and evaluating
the first message,

-calling the desired method with the transmitted parameters,

-converting the return value into a second SOAP message and returning the message as a
response via HTTP, and

- the instance of the call class on the client side analyzing the second message and returning the
obtained result

Che-Mponda teaches

-generating a first message by calling an instance of a call class of an Apache SOAP (Simple
Object Access Protocol) API (Application Programming Interface) and sets setting properties of

this object, (Che-Mponda, Figure 4, "Client API software" by using a SOAP envelope, the calling of an instance of a call class was made.)

-transmitting the first message to the server, (Che-Mponda, Figure 4, "Transmission via protocol")

- on the part of the server, a web server accepting the first

message with the call and evaluating the first message, (Che-Mponda. Figure 4, "Web Server")

-calling the desired method with the transmitted parameters, (Che-Mponda, Figure 4, "Servlets", interprets the desired method which is in xml file and responds back appropriately)

-converting the return value into a second SOAP message and

returning the message as a response via HTTP, (Che-Mponda, Figure 4, "Transmission via Web Protocol" and "Web server Software") and

- the instance of the call class on the client side analyzing the

second message and returning the obtained result (Che-Mponda, Figure 4, "Client API Software")

   Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Che-Mponda into Gassho. Gassho teaches various communicating between each other as seen in Gassho, Figure 1 however Gassho was silent on the type of protocol used to communicate between the elements. SOAP was a popular protocol used at the time of the invention was made and allowed effective communication between two units as in peer to peer connection.

Grohs in view of Gassho does not teach

- associating the sent URL with the Apache SOAP API's RPC router-servlet where the server-SOAP object is known.

- transmitting the call to this servlet,

-the RPC router-servlet analyzing the first SOAP message, determines determining the class to be called and initiating the call,

McLaughlin teaches

- associating the sent URL with the Apache SOAP API's RPC router-servlet where the server-SOAP object is known. (McLaughlin, Paragraph with header, "RPC or Messaging", the information is sent via HTTP since it uses a SOAP protocol and therefore a URL is necessary to identify the destination)

- transmitting the call to this servlet, (McLaughlin, Paragraph with header, "RPC or Messaging"

-the RPC router-servlet analyzing the first SOAP message, determines determining the class to be called and initiating the call, (McLaughlin, Paragraph with header, "RPC or Messaging", analyzes the message for errors)

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of McLaughlin into Grohs in view of Gassho. Grohs in view of Gassho teaches various communicating between each other as seen in Gassho, Figure 1 however Gassho was silent on the type of protocol used to communicate between the elements. SOAP was a popular protocol used at the time of the invention was made and allowed effective communication between two units as in peer to peer connection. However SOAP's protocol has it's faults and there are various options to overcome them. RPC router- servlet allows better error handling and passing of complex types across the network thus improving on the SOAP protocol.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the four references to obtain the invention in Claim 12.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO
MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after
the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period
will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37
CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,
however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this
final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to MING HON whose telephone number is (571)270-5245. The
examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri 7:30 to 5:00 EST; 1st Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Mark K. Zimmerman can be reached on (571)272-7653. The fax phone number for
the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would
like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated
information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Mark K Zimmerman/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625